



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

08/900,561 07/25/97 KELDERMAN

G AG-101RE

PM21/0210

JANSSON & SHUPE LTD  
245 MAIN STREET SUITE M  
RACINE WI 53403

EXAMINER

STORMER, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3612

4

DATE MAILED:

02/10/98

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire -3- month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 17-19 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 20-26 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Art Unit: 3612

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Purcell et al '424 (cited by Applicant).

Note the embodiment of figure 8 in which the drive wheel spans a majority of the dimension between the upper and lower track lengths.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al '424 in view of Yancey (cited by applicant).

Art Unit: 3612

Purcell et al meets all of the limitations of claim 17 as set forth in paragraph 2 above, but the idler wheels are not significantly smaller than the drive wheel.


Yancey teaches a track suspension arrangement in which the drive wheel 12 is shown to be at least one and a half times the diameter of the idler wheels 42. From this teaching it would have been obvious to reduce the size of the idler wheels of Purcell et al '424 in order to save weight or depending on the intended use of the vehicle. Those of ordinary skill in the art could readily determine the relative size of the drive wheel and the idler wheels based upon the intended use of the vehicle, the terrain or surface of operation, the type of track being used, etc.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

5. Claims 1-16 are allowed.
6. Claims 20-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell D. Stormer whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

rds

February 9, 1998

  
RUSSELL D. STORMER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER 2/9/98